

Appln No. 09/585,025
Amdt date March 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 and 47-51 are pending. Claims 1 and 29 are amended. Claims 52-82 are canceled.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara (US 5,825,893) in view of Slayden et al (US 5,680,629) and further in view of Rourke (US 5,384,886). In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations, "wherein the printing wizard determines top, center, or bottom offset, prints a quality assurance indicium, wherein the printing wizard includes a user interface for accepting user feedback about the printed quality assurance indicium, and wherein if the user feedback input in the user interface indicates that the quality assurance indicium prints correctly, the printing wizard then prints the VBI." Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

First, regarding the limitation of "wherein the printing wizard includes a user interface for accepting user feedback about the printed quality assurance indicium," none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this limitation. Kara or Slayden may include a user interface (UI), but that UI does not accept "user feedback about the printed quality assurance indicium." Similarly, Rourke cited FIG. 11 or any other portion does not teach accepting user feedback about the printed quality assurance indicium. Since none of the cited references teach the above limitation, the combination of the cited references, does not teach or suggest the above limitation.

Second, regarding the limitation of "if the quality assurance indicium prints correctly, the printing wizard then prints the VBI." The Examiner agreed in the Interview and the current Office action that Kara and Slayden, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this

Appln No. 09/585,025
Amdt date March 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

limitation. However, the Examiner states that Rourke teaches the above limitation because "printing sample of the envelop printing job [in FIG. 11 of Rourke] indicates that the clean copy would be printed only if said sample printing job prints correctly." (Office action, page 4, last paragraph, emphasis added.).

Applicants fail to see any teaching or suggestion in Rourke regarding the above statement. At best, Rourke teaches an envelop print mimic displayed on the screen. (col. 9, lines 9-12, col. 10, lines 42-44, and col. 7, lines 27-32.) There is no suggestion in Rourke that "the clean copy would be printed only if said sample printing job prints correctly." In fact, the user of Rourke's system may decide to go ahead and print the envelop even if the displayed mimic envelop would be a bit misplaced or out of line. Additionally, there is no indication in Rourke that the displayed mimic envelop is printed at all, not to mention if it is printed before the final desired envelop is printed. In other words, Rourke's mimic envelop is only displayed and not printed. In any way, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that it is a user feedback input in the user interface that indicates the quality assurance indicium prints correctly.

Third, regarding the limitation of "wherein if the user feedback input in the user interface indicates that the quality assurance indicium prints correctly, the printing wizard then prints the VBI." Rourke, alone or in combination with Kara and Slayden, does not teach or suggest the above limitation, because Rourke's system does not: **a)** print any quality assurance indicium (rather, it only displays a mimic envelop), **b)** have any means for accepting user feedback about the printed quality assurance indicium, or **c)** as explained above, the user of Rourke's system may decide to go ahead and print the envelop even if the displayed mimic envelop is misplaced or out of line.

Fourth, regarding the limitation of "wherein the printing wizard determines top, center, or bottom offset," Applicants respectfully disagree that Slayden teaches the above limitation. Rather, the offset determination steps of FIG. 21A of Slayden are not offsets for printing. These offsets are calculated for drawing each element that intersects with a paint rectangle in the

Appln No. 09/585,025
Amdt date March 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

preview window, and not for printing. (Col. 17, lines 44-52). Examiner stresses that "Microsoft like this reference or other document producing program ALREADY include the print wizard that enables the user to determine top, center or bottom offset and print the document." However, the Examiner cites Slayden "to show how this well-known printing wizard works." As explained above, Applicants fail to find any teaching in Slayden about the above limitation.

Consequently, based on at least the above-described **four arguments**, independent claim 1 is patentable over Kara, Slayden and Rourke. Dependent claims 2-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also patentable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claim 1, and for the additional limitations they include therein.

Claims 29-45, 47-51, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara in view of Rourke and further in view of Slivka (US 6,049,671).

Amended independent claim 29 recite "a first graphical user interface (GUI) for printing a sample print including a symbol," and "a second GUI for displaying a plurality of symbols for a user to select one of the displayed plurality of symbols matching the symbol printed on the sample print and based on the selected symbol, determining a print offset."

As described above, Kara and Rourke, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above limitation.

First, as explained above, Rourke does not print a sample print including a symbol." Rather, the mimic envelop of Rourke is just displayed. Second, Rourke does not teach "a second GUI for displaying a plurality of symbols for a user to select one of the displayed plurality of symbols matching the symbol printed on the sample print," as discussed above. Third, Rourke does not teach "based on the selected symbol, determining a print offset."

In short, independent claim 29 is patentable over the cited references. Dependent claims 30-45 and 47-51 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 29. Therefore, these

Appln No. 09/585,025
Amdt date March 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

claims are also patentable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claim 29, and for the additional limitations they include therein.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Raymond R. Tabandeh
Reg. No. 43,945
626/795-9900

RRT/clv

CLV PAS673560.1-* 03/21/06 3:44 PM